

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JACKELINE TORRES,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 19-cv-1112-pp

v.

ANDREW M. SAUL,

Defendant.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED
WITHOUT PREPAYING THE FILING FEE (DKT. NO. 2)**

The plaintiff has filed a complaint seeking judicial review of a final administrative decision denying her claim for disability insurance benefits under the Social Security Act. Dkt. No. 1. She also filed a motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 2.

To allow the plaintiff to proceed without paying the filing fee, the court first must decide whether the plaintiff can pay the fee; if not, it must determine whether the lawsuit is frivolous. 28 U.S.C. §§1915(a) and 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

Based on the facts in the plaintiff's affidavit, the court concludes that she does not have the ability to pay the filing fee. The plaintiff's affidavit states that she is not employed, not married, and has no dependents she is responsible for supporting. Dkt. No. 2 at 1. The plaintiff's total stated monthly income is \$746 from housing assistance and food stamps, *id.* at 2, and her monthly expenses are \$463, *id.* at 2-3. The plaintiff does not own a home, a car or any other

property of value, id. at 3-4, and she has no cash on hand or in a checking or savings account, id. at 3. The plaintiff states, “I have no income other than food stamps. My son helps with household expenses but he has his own, so it is difficult for him as well.” Id. at 4. The plaintiff has demonstrated that she cannot pay the \$350 filing fee and \$50 administrative fee.


The next step is to determine whether the case is frivolous. A case is frivolous if there is no arguable basis for relief either in law or in fact. Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 31 (1992) (quoting Nietzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); Casteel v. Pieschek, 3 F.3d 1050, 1056 (7th Cir. 1993)). A person may obtain district court review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security. 42 U.S.C. §405(g). The district court must uphold the Commissioner’s final decision as long as the Commissioner used the correct legal standards and the decision is supported by substantial evidence. See Roddy v. Astrue, 705 F.3d 631, 636 (7th Cir. 2013).

The plaintiff’s complaint indicates that she is seeking review of an unfavorable decision by the Commissioner of Social Security, and that the conclusions and findings in Commissioner’s decision denying her benefits are not supported by substantial evidence and/or are contrary to the Social Security regulation and law. Dkt. No. 1 at 1-2. At this early stage in the case, and based on the information in the plaintiff’s complaint, the court concludes that there may be a basis in law or in fact for the plaintiff’s appeal of the Commissioner’s decision, and that the appeal may have merit, as defined by 28 U.S.C. §1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

The court **GRANTS** the plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed without prepaying the filing fee. Dkt. No. 2.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 15th day of August, 2019.

BY THE COURT:



HON. PAMELA PEPPER
United States District Judge